



2875

United States Patent and Trademark Office
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Reference: Application No. 10/074,926
Applicant: Howard, Et Al.
Art Unit: 2875
Examiner: Peter J. Macchiarolo

Dear Sir:

This reply is to the Office Action in regard to application number 10/074,926 mailed 12/22/2003. I will reference my specific answers to the Examiner's statements to give my responses the best clarity. I ask for the understanding of the Examiner as I am an individual and not a patent attorney. I will do my best to explain the points regarding the application using layman's terms.

SECTION 1 Detailed Action

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The examiner does not appear to have any questions at this time regarding the information disclosure statement.

Drawings

2. "The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because there are several instances in where different reference characters have been used to designate the same parts. For example, reference numerals 11 and 24 have both been used to designate a surface device. Although the Examiner appreciates 11 is a side view and 24 is a top view of a surface device, the manner of referencing is confusing."

The inventor apologizes for any unclear or confusing elements of the drawings. New drawings will be submitted with this reply correcting this defect. In the new drawings a single reference numeral will refer to a single part, regardless of the view. In addition, every effort will be made the drawings clearer and easier to read.

3. "The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: 25,33."

The drawing reference to 33 has been removed from the new drawings as it is unnecessary to the description of the invention. The drawing reference 25 has been changed in this view to 11 as it describes the top view of an example of a digital integrated circuit. This example is shown on two places on the surface of the printed circuit board. The two examples (11) are different sizes on the surface for drawing recognition.

4. The drawings are objected to because the capacitor laminate and the layers as recited in claim 1 are not clearly shown. The examiner is interpreting the capacitor laminate to be shown as reference numeral 13 and the unlabeled substance therebetween in figure 1, and the layers being 14 and 15.

The examiner has interpreted the drawings correctly. The internal capacitor is formed by the two copper metal plates shown with and intervening dielectric. The new drawing tries to show this more clearly. The unlabeled substance is the intervening dielectric which typically is the same dielectric used throughout the printed circuit board.

Reference 14 is intended to designate a typical dielectric layer as shown in several places in the example figures and reference 15 is intended to designate a typical copper layer in several places.

5. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the method for forming a PCB as recited in claims 17-23, and 27 and the conductive layer as recited in claim 19 must be shown or the features(s) cancelled from the claims(s). No new matter should be entered.

Please see corrected Claims submitted with the corrected drawings attached to this reply.

6. Please see drawing corrections as referenced in this section numbers 2 and 3.

Claim Objections

7.&8. Claim informalities. Please see the corrected claims which have included the proper claim structure as explained by the examiner.

9. The word "the" will be removed in the corrected claims submitted with this reply.

10. Correction has been submitted for the examiner's approval.

Claim Rejections

11. In the corrected Claims, claim 1 has been corrected, claim 17 has been withdrawn and claim 24 has been corrected and has become claim 17.

12.&13. Please see the corrected claims submitted for the examiner's approval.

14. Claims 17-23 and 27 have been withdrawn in the corrected claims.